



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/625,241	07/22/2003	Travis J. Parry	200207325-1	8613
22879 7590 06/24/2008 HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400				
EXAMINER				
MILLA, MARK R				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2625				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/24/2008		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

JERRY.SHORMA@HP.COM

mkraft@hp.com

ipa.mail@hp.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/625,241

Applicant(s)

PARRY ET AL.

Examiner

Mark R. Milia

Art Unit

2625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 March 2008.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 27-37 and 53-58 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 27-37 and 53-58 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 22 July 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's amendment was received on 3/20/08 and has been entered and made of record. Currently, claims 1-6, 27-37, and 53-58 are pending.

Drawings

2. Applicant's amendment to the specification to include reference numeral **202** has overcome the objection set forth in the previous Office Action and has therefore been withdrawn.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 32 have been considered but are moot in view of the current amendment to the claims and therefore new ground(s) of rejection will be made. Newly added claims 53-58 will be addressed in the following rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
5. Claims 1-6, 32-34, 36-37, and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Phillips (US 6,332,062) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0234957 to Ohara.

Regarding claim 1, Phillips discloses a method of providing web content to a printing device, said method comprising attaching a memory module storing said web content to a printing device consumable (see Figs. 2 and 3, column 2 lines 8-18, and column 3 lines 21-30, reference states that a URL may be stored in the memory of the RFID and output for the user to see).

Phillips does not disclose expressly wherein said web content comprises content that is included in a web page that is served up by said printing device using an embedded web server.

Ohara discloses a web page that is served up by said printing device using an embedded web server, the web page being specified by a URL (see Fig. 1 and paragraph 31).

Regarding claim 32, Phillips discloses a consumable for use with a printing device, said consumable comprising: a printing device consumable (see Figs. 2 and 3 **32** and column 3 lines 10-12), a memory module attached to said printing device consumable (see Figs. 2 and 3 **36**, column 2 lines 8-18, and column 3 lines 21-30), and

web content stored on said memory module (see Figs. 2 and 3 50, column 2 lines 8-18, and column 3 lines 21-30).

Phillips does not disclose expressly wherein said web content comprises content is included in a web page that is served up by said printing device using an embedded web server.

Ohara discloses a web page that is served up by said printing device using an embedded web server, the web page being specified by a URL (see Fig. 1 and paragraph 31).

Regarding claim 53, Phillips discloses a method of providing web content for a printing device, said method comprising: storing web content on a memory module attached to a printing device consumable (see Figs. 2 and 3, column 2 lines 8-18, and column 3 lines 21-30, reference states that a URL may be stored in the memory of the RFID and output for the user to see), uploading said web content from said memory module to said printing device when said consumable is installed in said printing device (see Figs. 2 and 3, column 2 lines 8-18, column 3 lines 21-30, column 3 line 45-column 4 line 5, and column 4 lines 57-60), and, said web content provided to said printing device with said memory module attached to said printing device consumable (see Figs. 2 and 3, column 2 lines 8-18, and column 3 lines 21-30).

Phillips does not disclose expressly serving up a web page with said printing device using an embedded web server.

Ohara discloses serving up a web page with said printing device using an embedded web server (see Fig. 1 and paragraph 31).

Phillips & Ohara are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, providing web content to a printer device.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the embedded web server, as described by Ohara, and which is well known in the art, with the system of Phillips.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to quickly and efficiently view the URL stored on the RFID without putting added burden on the user.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Ohara with Phillips to obtain the invention as specified in claims 1, 32, and 53.

Regarding claim 2, Phillips further discloses installing said printing device consumable in said printing device (see Figs. 2 and 3, column 2 lines 8-18, and column 3 lines 21-30) and interfacing said printing device and said memory module (see column 3 lines 45-65).

Regarding claim 3, Phillips further discloses uploading said web content from said memory module to a memory of said printing device (see Fig. 3, column 3 line 66-column 4 line 5, and column 4 lines 57-60).

Regarding claim 4, Phillips further discloses uploading a web content interface from said memory module to a memory of said printing device (see Fig. 3, column 3 line 66-column 4 line 5, and column 4 lines 57-60).

Regarding claim 5, Phillips further discloses executing said web content interface with a controller of said printing device (see Figs. 3 and 4 and column 4 line 42-column 5 line 38).

Regarding claim 6, Phillips further discloses using said web content on said memory module through said web content interface (see Figs. 3 and 4 and column 4 line 42-column 5 line 38).

Regarding claim 33, Phillips further discloses a wireless interface for said memory module for interfacing and communicating with a printing device (see Fig. 3 (36) and column 3 lines 45-65).

Regarding claim 34, Phillips further discloses wherein said wireless interface comprises a radio frequency interface (see Fig. 3 (36) and column 3 lines 45-65).

Regarding claim 36, Phillips further discloses a wired interface for said memory module for interfacing and communicating with a printing device (see column 3 lines 36-38).

Regarding claim 37, Phillips further discloses a web content interface stored on said memory module which, when uploaded to a printing device, allows access and use of said web content on said memory module (see Figs. 2 and 3, column 2 lines 8-18, column 3 lines 21-30, column 3 line 45-column 4 line 5, and column 4 lines 57-60).

6. Claims 27-28 and 54-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Phillips and Ohara as applied to claims 1 and 53 above, and further in view Richards et al. (US 6,532,351).

Regarding claims 27 and 54, Phillips discloses the ability to write content to the RFID memory module from a printing device or any device with an interrogating device (see column 3 lines 45-52) and storing said web content on said memory module attached to said printing device consumable (see Figs. 2 and 3, column 2 lines 8-18, and column 3 lines 21-30).

Phillips and Ohara do not disclose expressly receiving data specifying desired web content from a purchaser of a printing device consumable.

Richards discloses receiving data specifying desired web content from a purchaser of a printing device consumable (see Fig. 2, column 4 line 4-column 5 line 32, column 6 lines 10-16, and column 7 lines 36-64, reference states that any number of items can be stored on the memory module prior to shipping the printing device consumable).

Phillips & Richards are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, memory modules attached to printing device consumables.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the specifying of desired content from a purchaser of a printing device consumable, as described by Richards, with the system of Phillips and Ohara.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide stored content that will aid a user in using a printing device and therefore increase overall system efficiency.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Richards with Phillips and Ohara to obtain the invention as specified in claim 27.

Regarding claims 28 and 55, Richards further discloses providing said printing device consumable with said memory module to said purchaser (see column 7 lines 36-64).

7. Claims 29-31 and 56-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Phillips, Ohara, and Richards as applied to claims 27 and 54 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0240518 to Ishizuka.

Regarding claims 29 and 56, Phillips, Ohara and Richards do not disclose expressly wherein said receiving data specifying said web content from a purchaser comprises receiving said web content through a terminal at a consumables sales facility.

Ishizuka discloses wherein said receiving data specifying said web content from a purchaser comprises receiving said web content through a terminal at a consumables sales facility (see paragraphs 20-21).

Regarding claims 30 and 57, Phillips, Ohara and Richards do not disclose expressly wherein said receiving data specifying said web content from a purchaser comprises receiving said web content from said purchaser through a computer network.

Ishizuka discloses wherein said receiving data specifying said web content from a purchaser comprises receiving said web content from said purchaser through a computer network (see paragraphs 20-21).

Phillips, Richards, & Ishizuka are combinable because they are from a similar field of endeavor, printing device consumable that are purchased by a user/customer/purchaser.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the system of purchasing a printing device consumable, such as a toner/ink cartridge via a terminal connected over a network to a manufacturer/sales facility, as described by Ishizuka, with the system of Phillips, Ohara and Richards.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to enable a user to purchase the correct consumable item by providing the appropriate information and having the item shipped to the user, which is well known in the art and commonly utilized.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Ishizuka with Phillips, Ohara and Richards to obtain the invention as specified in claims 29-30.

Regarding claims 31 and 58, Ishizuka further discloses wherein said computer network comprises the Internet (see Fig. 1 and paragraph 20).

8. Claim 35 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Phillips and Ohara as applied to claim 32 above, and further in view of Richards.

Phillips and Ohara do not disclose expressly wherein said wireless interface comprises an infrared interface.

Richards discloses wherein said wireless interface comprises an infrared interface (see column5 lines 10-14).

Phillips & Richards are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, memory modules attached to printing device consumables.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the infrared wireless interface, as described by Richards, with the system of Phillips.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to have an alternative wireless connection to a radio frequency interface, both of which are well known and commonly used wireless interfaces.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Richards with Phillips and Ohara to obtain the invention as specified in claim 35.

Conclusion

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark R. Milia whose telephone number is (571)272-7408. The examiner can normally be reached M-F 8:00am-4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Moore can be reached at (571) 272-7437. The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Mark R. Milia
Examiner
Art Unit 2625

Art Unit: 2625

/Mark R. Milia/

Examiner, Art Unit 2625

/David K Moore/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625